

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In Re Application of: )  
Inventors: Andrew Ferlitsch )  
Serial No.: 10/659,513 ) ATTORNEY FILE NO.  
Filed: September 10, 2003 ) SLA1305  
Title: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR ) Customer No.: 55,286  
MAINTAINING A DEVICE ) Examiner: Rodriguez,  
JOB HISTORY ) Lennin  
 ) Conf. No.: 3618

Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

## REPLY BRIEF

This brief is responsive to an Examiner's Answer filed on December 28, 2009, by Examiner Lennin R. Rodriguez, Group Art Unit 2625, regarding the above-referenced application.

## REMARKS

The **Response to Argument** Section of the Examiner's Answer (page 28) states that the Richter reference is being relied upon to teach the claim limitations of filtering the job record to create a filtered history of jobs associated with the client, col. 23, ln. 7-15, where the jobs are being associated with respective clients, and the job log is stored (col. 9, ln. 66 through col. 10, ln. 2 and col. 22, ln. 4-5).

As noted in detail in the Applicant's Appeal Brief (see page 10), col. 23, ln. 7-15 does not disclose filtering the job record to create a filtered history of jobs associated with the client. Rather, the cited section states that a client print server link on at least one client computer permits a client computer to filter information relevant to that computer, and to receive and display the status of at least one print job based upon the filtered information. The cited passage does not disclose maintaining a job history. In fact, the cited passage does not even disclose the retention of "filtered information". More important, the above-cited passages do not disclose maintaining a job history *in an imaging device*, as recited in the claimed invention.

Col. 9. ln. 66 through col. 10, ln. 2, states, "(i)n a preferred embodiment of the client print server link 16, stored information, such as print logs, and job logs, can either be stored at the client computer 12, at the print server 32, or within an administrative print server link 26." The above-quoted passage does *not* state that a print log or job log is maintained by an imaging device. Further, as discussed below, a job log is not a history of previously performed jobs.

Col. 22, ln. 4-5 states, "(o)ther administrative job log controls include update list 410, store to disk control 412, print job list control 414,

and delete selected job control 416”, see Fig. 30. The content of the job list includes “document start time 422”, “document end time 424”, and “document process time 426”, col. 22, ln. 7-12. None of these terms are explicitly defined. More important, none of these terms are defined as being associated with jobs that have already been performed.

Since the clear intent of the Richter disclosure is to control jobs in progress, the Applicant submits that these terms define projected start, end, and process times for jobs in a queue that have not yet printed. Support for this assumption can be found in a number of passages. For example, “(t)he client print server 16 provides client users with pertinent information regarding the *current* (emphasis added) status of each of their print jobs 18 ...” col. 5, ln. 18-22. Also, “(a) client user can also use the client print server link 16 to pre-determine the *current* (emphasis added) status of one or more print servers 32a-32n and connected output devices 40a-40n (i.e. before sending one or more print jobs 18)” col. 5, ln. 31-34. Alternately considered, Richter does not even mention a client accessing a print server for the purpose of analyzing a history of jobs that have already been performed.

Finally, the print log of Fig. 30 is *not* maintained by an imaging device, as recited in the claimed invention, but rather by an administrative workstation 24 (see Fig. 2) or print server 32.

The ***Response to Argument*** Section (page 28) also states that Richter teaches the limitation of using different criteria “to filter the jobs and the one used here could be the admitted prior art teaching of a network address.” However, the assertion is not supported by a citation. Further, even if this assertion was correct, the cited passage does not

disclose a job record maintained in a imaging device, after the performance of the job.

As noted in the Applicant's Appeal Brief, Richter discloses a 2-way link between a client computer and a printing system, where the printing system includes a print server interposed between the client computer and the printers (col. 3, ln. 22-39). The print server is able to provide information to the client such as job status, and when a "jam" occurs (col. 5, ln. 18-30). Richter's print server does not maintain a job record, after the performance of a job. Neither does Richter's imaging device maintain such a job record, as recited in the claimed invention.

The ***Response to Argument*** Section of the Examiner's Answer (pages 28 and 29) states that the Carney reference is cited to disclose the limitation of a repository residing in the imaging device (Fig. 1, job monitor 119) having an interface to accept a record of the jobs performed by the device [0013], and the repository maintaining the job record after the performance of the job [0012].

Paragraph [0012] states that the Carney invention addresses "...the complexity of job processing by viewing the job at a higher conceptual plane, wherein a repository of attributes and status associated with each print job that passes through the system is contained and managed." Paragraph [0013] states that the Carney invention "...includes a repository of attributes and status information associated with each print job that passes through a printer system and providing an interface to a plurality of components to allow access to the attributes and status information in the repository by the plurality of components."

More explicitly, Carney describes a Job Monitor as a module that “...contains and manages a repository of attributes and status associated with each print job that passes through the system” [0034]. Interfaces to the Job Monitor 200 provide the ability for components to process a job according to the unique requirements of the processing component, and report job attributes and processing status of the job to the Job Monitor for common access by other components [0039]. “The Job Monitor 200 provides a global view of jobs within the printer, including the actively printing print jobs, jobs in the process of being spooled, jobs on the spool queue, and jobs on the pull print queue” [0041]. It should be noted that the Job Monitor does not provide a “view” of a job, once the job has been performed.

Fig. 3 illustrates a table 300 that identifies the attributes maintained for each job [0048]. The Applicant notes that “job history” is not one of the identified attributes. “Attributes for an existing job are also obtained by calling the Job Monitor.....If the job does not exist, then an error is returned” [0051].

The Applicant respectfully submits that Carney’s Job Monitor manages attributes and the status of a job in queue to be printed. No mention is made of the Job Monitor maintaining a record of jobs that have already been performed by a print system. Once the job is printed, its attributes are no longer maintained.

In Summary, the combination of Richter and Carney does not disclose an imaging device that maintains a job record, or an imaging device that filters the job history by client network address. The combination of references does not disclose a client that receives a job

history from the imaging device, and creates a filtered history of jobs associated with only that client. All these limitations are cited in the Applicant's base claims. Since the combination of references neither explicitly discloses nor suggests these limitations, the Applicant requests that the claims be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 1/19/2010

/Gerald Maliszewski/

Gerald Maliszewski  
Registration No. 38,054

Customer Number 55,286  
P.O. Box 270829  
San Diego, CA 92198-2829  
Telephone: (858) 451-9950  
Facsimile: (858) 451-9869  
gerry@ipatentit.com